

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 11 continue to be in the application.

New claims 12 to 18 are being submitted.

New claim 12 is based on Fig. 2 of the application.

New claim 13 is based on Fig. 3 of the application.

New claim 14 is based on Fig. 4A of the application.

New claim 15 is based on Fig. 4A of the application.

New claim 16 is based on Fig. 4A of the application.

New claim 17 is based on Fig. 4B of the application.

New claim 18 is based on Fig. 4b of the application.

The Office Action of June 9, 2004 states that the following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

New claims 12 to 18 are deemed to meet the requirement. It is planned to modify claims 1 through 11 in a Supplemental Amendment..

*The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102.*

3. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lampke, US Patent No. 2,808,749.

Lampke discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11, i.e., power wrench comprising a handle containing a motor: a ratchet extension (41); a ratchet extension shaft 955); and a ratchet head (1).

New claims 12 through 18 require that an air drive motor is present, whereas Lampe teaches an electric motor.

6. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hendrickson, US Patent No. 3,430,510. Hendrickson clearly anticipates the above claims, e.g., Figs. 2 and 5.

Claims 12 through 18 require an air drive motor not taught by Hendrickson.

7. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11 (as best understood) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pijanowski, US Patent No. 5,967,002.

Pijanowski anticipates the above claims as best understood, i.e., handle (23); a head removable from the handle, an extension and an extension shaft (23).

Claims 12 through 18 require an air drive motor not taught by Pijanowski.

8. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frenkel (5,709,136).

Frenkel discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11, i.e., power wrench comprising a handle containing a motor; ratchet extensions (14) (14'); ratchet extension shafts (34); and a ratchet head (12).

Frenkel does not teach a ratchet extension shaft only supported at its ends as required in claims 12 through 18.

*The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.*

10. Claims 2, 4, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anyone of Lampke. AAPA. D' Haem et al.. Hendrickson and Pijanowski.

Each of the above mentioned prior art meets the limitations of the above claims except for disclosing an extension and a shaft having a length between 6 to thirty inches. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an extension and a corresponding shaft having a length of approximately 6-30", since it has been held that changing shape, dependent on work-piece parameters, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 US PQ 284(CCPA1954).

Claims 12 through 18 are deemed to clearly define the invention over the applied references.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frenkel. Frenkel meets all of the limitations of claims 6, including plurality of extensions for reaching remote zones of varying distances (e.g., col. 1, line 49), except for disclosing the range or a specific size of the extensions. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an extension and a corresponding shaft having a length of approximately between 6"-30", e.g.. 8" for reaching a corresponding zone, since it has been held that changing shape, dependent on work-piece parameters, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 US PQ 284(CCPA1954) and as suggested by Frenkel.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no teaching in Frenkel to have a ratchet extension shaft only supported at its ends as required in claims 12 to 18 newly submitted.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Boccadutre

By: Horst M. Kasper

Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,  
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059  
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977  
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: FRB211

rep/am